



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/626,476	07/23/2003	Paul W. Skinner	021028-000120US	1328

37490 7590 08/04/2005

CARPENTER & KULAS, LLP
1900 EMBARCADERO ROAD
SUITE 109
PALO ALTO, CA 94303

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, DINH Q

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3752

DATE MAILED: 08/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/626,476

Applicant(s)

SKINNER, PAUL W.

Examiner

Dinh Q. Nguyen

Art Unit

3752

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 May 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 35-57 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 35-57 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 35, 38, 39, 41, 43, 44, 45, 49, 54-57 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 28-63 of copending Application No. 10/404,597. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because of common subject matter, as follow:

Claim 35 of the instant application cites a conduit, an outlet, and a sensor, which are fully disclosed in claim 28 and 29 of the '597 application.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 35-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hall, III in view of Chaplinsky.

Hall, III discloses a vegetation dispensing device comprising: a conduit 190 with a channel 195 (see figure 14), an outlet 232 for conveying a substance 206a-c, a sensor 200 couple to the conduit 231 for sensing a growth condition, a flow control 205 for regulating an amount of substance, a microprocessor control system 10, the plurality of sensors such as soil moisture, ground temperature, ion concentration (as disclosed in column 15, lines 34-60). Hall, III does not disclose the sensor being coupled to the conduit. However, Chaplinsky discloses an apparatus for dispensing material to vegetation having sensor 18 coupled to conduit P (see figure 1). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have provided the device of Hall, III with a sensor being coupled to the conduit as suggested by Chaplinsky. Doing so would provide an effective way to dispense material to vegetation (see Chaplinsky's column 2, lines 1-26).

With respect to claims 41, 43-47, 50, 52, and 53, Hall, III in view of Chaplinsky do not disclose expressly the sensors such as leaf wetness sensor, insect sensor, DNA sensor, sugar accumulation sensor, pheromone sensor or protein sensor etc. At the time the invention was made, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to a person of ordinary skill in the art to provide the Hall, III device with the above sensors, because Applicant has not disclosed that the above sensors provides an advantage, or

solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected Applicant's invention to perform equally well with any of the above sensors because they provide a way to monitor a condition of vegetation. Therefore, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify the device of Hall, III and Chaplinsky to obtain the invention as specified in claims 41, 43-47, 50, 52, and 53. Furthermore, it is obvious to one skilled in the art to provide the Hall, III and Chaplinsky device with any type of sensors (see Hall, III column 15, lines 43-45).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 5/23/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 35-57 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dinh Q. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-4907. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 6:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Scherbel can be reached on 571-272-4919. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3752

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Dinh Q. Nguyen', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Dinh Q. Nguyen
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3752

dqn